THE BULLETIN

of the

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION

of

SCHOOL SOCIAL WORKERS

SEPTEMBER 1955

Volume XXXI Number 1

LIBRARY
ELIZABETH McCORMICK MEMORIAL FUND
155 E. Ohio Street
Chicago 11

NATIONAL OFFICE

Room 810
One Park Avenue, New York 16, N. Y.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

PRESIDENT

OPAL BOSTON
3140 N. Meridian Street
Indianapolis, Ind.

VICE-PRESIDENTS

FLORENCE POOLE
3130 Hartzel
Evanston, Ill.

MRS. WALTER DRISCOLL
834 Summit Avenue
St. Paul 5, Minn.

SECRETARY

MARGARET QUANE
Evanston Township High School
1600 Dodge Street
Evanston, Ill.

TREASURER

ALMA LAABS
Minneapolis Public Schools
Jackson Building
Mineapolis, Ind.

Mrs. Marjorie Everinghim
Baltimore, Md.

Claire S. Norton
Hartford, Conn.

Helen Harland
Champaign, Ill.

Mr. Ray Graham
Springfield, Ill.

Miriam Witham
San Francisco, Calif.

Ruth Gaunt
Milwaukee, Wis.

Adeline Jesse
Denver, Colo.

Gladys Hall
New Orleans, La.

Louise McKee
Berkeley, Calif.

Virginia Quattlebaum
Tifton, Ga.

Mrs. Mary Medler
Houston, Texas

Mrs. Amorette Richards
Seattle, Wash.

Mrs. Louis S. Weiss
New York, N. Y.

Louise Clevenger
Pasadena, Calif.

Ruth Smalley
Philadelphia, Pa.

COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

EDUCATION

Florence Poole
School of Social Welfare Admin.
University of Illinois
Urbana, Ill.

MEMBERSHIP

Mrs. Helen Roell
Indianapolis Public Schools
150 N. Meridian Street
Indianapolis, Ind.

PROGRAM

Louise McKee
570 Woodmont Avenue
Berkeley, Calif.

BULLETIN

Clara M. Colteryahn, Editor
Board of Education
Bellefield at Forbes Street
Pittsburgh 13, Pa.

FINANCE

Alma Laabs
Minneapolis, Minn.

NOMINATING

Ruth Gaunt
Milwaukee Public Schools
1111 N. 10th Street
Milwaukee, Wis.

This is the final issue of THE BULLETIN of the National Association of School Social Workers. *Social Work,* professional publication of the National Association of Social Work, will replace THE BULLETIN. Within *Social Work* will be a supplement of material pertaining to school social work.

Present members of NASSW and subscribers to THE BULLETIN will receive the first issue of *Social Work,* expected to be published January, 1956.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

https://archive.org/details/bulletin-national-association-of-school-social-workers_1955-09_31_1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Editorial Comment 2

Social Group Work in the Schools
Paul Simon 3-12

School Social Work as it Relates to Community Services
Arch Thurman 13-28

The School Social Worker Helps the Child Through Collaboration With Other School Personnel
Jane Wille 29-33

Children With Anti-school Patterns
John G. Milner 34-40

EDITORIAL COMMENT

The use of professional social group workers in the public schools is relatively new and untried. Mr. Simon's article describes a project in which a school of social work and the public schools cooperated in examining and demonstrating the role of a social group worker in helping children with problems which interfere with effective school participation.

Mr. Simon describes social group work methods and principles which applied in the project, identifying the service clearly as social work and differentiating it from other types of work done with groups. The article will be of interest to educators, school social workers, and parents in their considerations of services helpful to children in school.

Mr. Thurman's article presents a valuable addition to the literature in school social work. As a Director of Mental Health Education, he brings a broad perspective to his examination of the role of the school social worker. His discussion of the work in Utah gives many valuable suggestions for communities interested in integration of total services for children.

Basic to effective school social work practice is the development of skill in collaboration with other school personnel. Miss Wille's article presents some of the problems in attainment of such collaboration. It also examines some of the attitudes necessary for a school social worker and describes procedures which will assist all school personnel in the utilization of special services.

The meaning of school to children varies widely, and is influenced by early family relationships. Dr. Milner's article gives consideration to the kinds of family experiences which may seriously affect the child's social participation and learning in the school setting.

SOCIAL GROUP WORK IN THE SCHOOLS

PAUL SIMON, Associate Professor
School of Social Work, University of Illinois

A project in the use of social group work was carried on in the Champaign public schools from February, 1949, to June, 1951. During this period six different groups involving fifty-one different members were organized. Two of the groups were organized in February and continued to the end of the school year. The other four groups were organized in October and continued to June. All groups were independent of each other, none being continuous from one year to the next.

Three different student group workers were used and were assigned to the social work department of the schools under the supervision of the director. Additional consultation for the workers was provided by group work faculty of the School of Social Work of the University of Illinois. The project was planned with the cooperation of the superintendent of schools, the principals and teachers of the three elementary schools in which the project was housed. The groups met in special rooms in each school building. Only boys' groups, limited to eight members were organized with ages in the total group served ranging from eight to thirteen. A small budget for supplies and equipment was provided.

Social work in the schools currently consists primarily of casework with children and parents with concomitant relationships to teachers and others derived from the fact that the school social worker becomes a member of the faculty. The child's adjustment to life, especially that which is reflected in his school experience is the major point of departure in offering school social work services. Assuming that children might be helped to resolve some of their problems in interpersonal relationships through use of a selected group experience the project in the use of group work in the school setting was initiated. The primary objective in offering this service was to help the child in his relationship to his peers and teachers. The work was not conceived as "group therapy" aimed toward treatment or reduction of any emotional disorders. Rather, it was hoped that the child could be helped to make greater use of his capacities for getting along with others in spite of the presence or absence of any emotional disturbances. Some children continued to receive casework and other services along with their participation in the group. The

group was seen only as an adjunct to the services designed to help the child and not as a substitute for casework or any other service provided by the school.

Children were nominated for the group by the teacher. The chief criterion suggested was that the youngster was not getting along with his fellow classmates as well as he might. In general, boys from the same grade were chosen which meant that the age range was limited to one or two years and there was already some acquaintanceship among the boys. The teacher, principal, director of school social work and group worker then consulted with each other for final selection of the eight members for each group, an arbitrarily selected number. Although each child gave evidence of some emotional disturbance these factors were not critically examined as the basis for grouping. They were loosely used so that both extremely aggressive children and extremely withdrawn children were not in the same group, although in final terms each group represented a mixture of somewhat aggressive and somewhat withdrawn children.

Each boy was interviewed by the group worker following an interview by the director of school social work who introduced the worker to the boy. He was invited to join a special group meeting one day a week after school and especially formed for boys who were not getting along as well as they might. In each case the child was told that his name had been suggested by his teacher as an indication both of her recognition of his needs and her interest in him. The response to this approach was usually very positive in that the boy was able to recognize some of his own difficulties and was willing to discuss them in general terms. He was told that the group worker would try to help him get along better with his friends and further to help him make new friends. The child, of course, was curious as to what the group would do and usually was interested in the description of various play activities outlined by the worker. The child was also told that this was another school activity and the usual school rules regarding equipment, running in the halls, etc., would be observed.

While no set formula was used in inviting the boy to join, the interviews always covered recognition of the existence of a problem, the offer of help by the group worker, the kinds of activities anticipated and some of the limits which would operate. In addition, the child was told that his parents or guardians would have to give their approval and the worker would talk to them, or had already talked to them, to tell them about the group.

In some instances, parents were seen prior to the interview with the boy and in some cases the home visit followed. The decision was made by the director of school social work in light of her knowledge of the situation and what seemed most appropriate.

Usually the boys were most interested in the prospects for play and adventure. There was invariably tension during the interview which the worker sought to ease by leading into a discussion of interests and potential play activities. This frequently was found to be reassuring, although such factors as newness of the situation as well as the fact that he had been chosen because of his difficulties may have contributed more to the child's uneasiness. In general, the boys invited seemed eager to join the group. The following interview by the group worker is typical:

"Albert was excused from class to talk to me. I told him about the club, its activities, the time and place of meeting and the other boys who were in it. He said he knew most of them. Albert is eleven years old and a little small for his age. He is a good-looking boy with blond hair and brown eyes. He seemed a little tense during the interview but the flow of speech from him was soft and constant. I told him that the boys in the group had been selected because they were having difficulty of one sort or another and we thought a group of this sort would help them with their school work. I asked him if he thought the group would help him. He said he thought it would. He said he had done good work in grade three and then poor work in grade four, but now he was doing good work again although he was no A student but got B's and C's. He said that he looked forward to joining this club because in the past he had somehow always been left out when it came to getting in anything like this. I asked him what he meant. He said he couldn't exactly explain, but his brother was able to go many places and do many things but he couldn't because he was so small. He said his brother was in high school and had a car. Albert went on to say that he has hardly anything to do at home except play with his dog. I told him he would now find some extra things to do in club and he agreed.

Albert seemed self-confident and appeared to enjoy the special privilege of talking with an adult outside the class; he pursued the conversation avidly. I asked what activities he was interested in. He mentioned beadwork and described some things he would like to do with beads. He described a bird house he had made and indicated that he was handy around the house, always cleaning up after his dog and generally taking care of things. I complimented him on this and after checking time and place of the first meeting, he returned to his room."

Parents and guardians were usually aware of some difficulties the children were having and were interested in help for them. Parents usually did not seem threatened by the prospect of referral to a group for the child. In some instances, problems of their own were brought out and these were followed up by the caseworker, developing whatever plans seemed appropriate to the situation. The group worker kept in

touch with the parents but consistent and regular follow-up was not done in all cases. Work with the parents required careful clearance between group worker and caseworker. In some instances, as noted earlier, members of the group were also seeing a caseworker regularly who might also be maintaining a working relationship with the parent. Under these circumstances, the caseworker took responsibility for discussing the child's progress in the group as well as in the classroom. In addition, some parents were occasionally in touch with the principal or teacher.

The original interview with the parent was conducted by the group worker except when the social work department was previously in touch with the family. Usually the principal called the family and told them a group was being organized and that the worker would make an appointment to visit. The principal also mentioned the school's recognition of some problems with the child. Reactions to this varied, but in general reflected interest on the part of the parent that some help was available. The home visit with Albert's mother is illustrative of the first interview.

"Mrs. Shafer is a youngish looking woman with light hair and complexion, and her face seemed to express some uncertainty and fear as we began to talk. She had told Albert about the group yesterday and he had seemed enthusiastic about joining, but she was not sure why he had been invited. She felt that he was having some trouble at school and yesterday was the first time she had become concerned about it when the principal telephoned. I said that we would be carrying on a program of crafts, games, trips and other things because boys liked to do these things, but this was really secondary to the objective of helping the boy get along better with other children. I said that we thought the group would be a place where children would be able to work out some of their difficulties in getting along with each other.

"Mrs. Shafer said that Albert was not shy. He was too straight forward and had a habit of talking back to the teacher. She gave some examples of this and said she had discussed this with the teacher. The teacher had suggested Albert might need more firm handling at home, that she had recently tried this and it seemed to be helpful. Mrs. Shafer added that Albert was a bright boy but does not always get along as he should. She went on to compare him with his older brother who was more shy and made the comment that the two were quite different. I told her it was natural for two children to be different and went on to say that we would try to help Albert in the group. She thought the group would be good for him and asked what she ought to do about making him come. I told her that attendance was purely voluntary and that it would be all right if Albert did not want to come. I added that not all boys might benefit from a group of this kind, but we would want Albert to try it and it would be helpful if she would encourage him to come. I told her I would be seeing him tomorrow to explain the plan, tell him why he was invited, and ask him to join the group."

The groups met in general purpose rooms in the school building and members were told that certain rules about disturbing other equipment in the room would have to be observed and that they would have to use only those things which the worker designated. Equipment used was very simple. A mat was provided for tusseling; a few table games, paper, crayons, and several comic books completed the list for beginning meetings. Balls were not used because lights were unprotected. In mild weather, groups sometimes played outdoors. As the boys came in for the first meeting they were told they could play with what they chose from the things available. There was no formality to this and no attempt at group organization. Quiet was requested only when it was necessary to make some announcement. Some of the more active boys would usually begin by wrestling while more quiet boys were able to select individual activity. The effort here was to keep the expectation of group cooperation to a minimum and to permit the formation of small friendship subgroups. Boys around nine, ten, and eleven usually are able to form semipermanent pair friendships before they are ready to assume some responsibility to a wider group. Preceding this stage in his social development, the boy will tend to form transient or fleeting pair relationships. It was assumed that these boys were retarded in their social development and observation sustained this.

In early meetings, many of the activities showed aggressive or withdrawn behavior and lack of capacity to get along with each other. The tusseling on the mat frequently ended in arguments. Table games involving minimal cooperation between two boys were at first easily disrupted. Some would retreat to drawing on reading comic books. The group worker sought to encourage pair friendships at the start and to develop an understanding relationship with each boy. Limits were used at the point where the aggressive behavior threatened to erupt into fights but otherwise very few were used. Stories were always of interest and this was one spot at which group members, relating primarily to the worker, were able to act as a group. Refreshments were served, usually consisting of soft drinks and cookies, and some formality was arranged here by the worker, again calling for a minimum of group cooperation.

Most decisions in the beginning were made on the basis of individual choice. It was not until the later stages of growth that the groups were able to participate in democratic decision making. However, the worker tried to encourage self-government in the group, without requiring too high a level of cooperation by using group discussion methods whenever possible. Since the group members were anxious about their own secur-

ity they were not expected to show much ability to adjust to the needs of others. Consequently, program planning always allowed for individual preference. However, as group members became more secure in their relationships with the worker as well as with each other, they were able to plan and carry out such projects as trips, picnics, ball games, and other projects involving joint agreements.

Many group members learned new skills in crafts, games, dramatics, simple puppetry, and much interest was shown in individual achievement. The boys were usually very dependent upon the worker for program suggestions since their own resources and abilities were meager. After several months, however, group members were able to take more responsibility for planning. In one visit made by a principal, pleasant surprise was expressed at how relaxed the boys were, how long they were able to remain seated at craft work and how well they were able to cooperate in cleaning up. The presence of the principal may have been a factor here, except that similar behavior was noted by the group worker on many other occasions.

The worker usually found that the nature of group conversation during activities provided the best opportunities for development of good relationships and helpful solutions to many problems faced by the children. At many points the youngsters discussed their teachers, the subjects they liked and disliked. In one instance, several of the boys drew clocks pointing the hands to the hour school let out and noting it as the favorite time of day. The worker encouraged the youngsters to express their feelings about school although they identified the worker as a member of the faculty.

"Hal said he hated teachers. The words came out of his mouth quickly and without control. He looked at me and mumbled something as if he wanted to retrieve what he had said. I said sometimes you feel like loving a teacher and sometimes like hating her. One of the other boys said he didn't hate his teacher."

At another point one of the members expressed his feelings while working on an art project.

"Pete said he was glad he could work on this instead of having to do school work. He said that I did not know how hard school work could be. I said that I guessed it could be hard. But I also guessed it had to be done. I asked Pete what was difficult in class. He said he had to make reports and did not like to. He said he made them anyway. He wished he could have some of this kind of fun in class. I asked him if class could be fun at times. He said that it could and that he liked school."

Actually the boys sensed or knew the worker's values and also knew

of his hopes for them that they could get along better in school. However, the worker encouraged free expression and usually relied upon the group to express value judgments which did exert some pressure on the individual.

"Allen said the teacher would never know who let the air out of her tires last year. I said he must have been worrying about what she would do if she ever found out he did it. Several other boys chimed in and said they knew Allen did it and he shouldn't have. I said to Allen what did he think would happen now if the teacher found out. He said he didn't think she'd be so mad and maybe someday he'd tell her. Several others said he should tell her and he kept saying maybe I will."

Group members occasionally invited teachers or the principal to visit their meetings. At one of these meetings, the group was engaged in painting.

"Meanwhile a discussion about school had been started. Henry said that he hated school. Albert said he shouldn't hate school. (I looked at the principal. She winced and could not conceal her perturbation but said nothing.) Henry insisted that he did not like school. I asked him why. He said that he had to read all the time. He said he wanted to have fun. He said in response to my question that fun meant drawing and painting. I asked him if he did not do this in class. He said he did. Later the principal said to me laughingly that I must have great patience to spend so much time sitting and talking with Henry. I said that the boys in the group responded well to the informality and in this relaxed air they were releasing feelings and also learning to relate to each other. The principal said I really had my hands full."

Teacher response to the project was, of course, varied and one reason why the worker was pleased when group members invited teachers and principal to visit, was the way in which this helped them see what was happening. Naturally in a project of this newness there was some possibility of threat to the teacher. In one instance, the teacher told the worker that the boys were behaving badly in class. She wanted the worker to do something about it. Now they became "his boys" and she held him responsible for their behavior. She went on to say that it appeared that the boys were learning to misbehave in the group and the right discipline was not being used. In talking this through, the worker pointed out as carefully as possible that the youngsters had problems and were upset before the group was organized. This was why they were referred by the teacher. It also seemed necessary to make clear that the origin of their troubles was elsewhere than in the classroom or the group. On the whole, teachers responded best when they were helped to see that all school forces would have to be brought together in the interests of the child and there was no magic or guarantee of success in the group work project.

Teachers working in the quiet of their classrooms after school hours were disturbed when the boys would break out of their club room and run down the hall to water fountains or lavatory. Also, they were actually mystified by the worker's method and did not always agree with his interpretations of behavior when progress was discussed. On the other hand, the group workers needed to work through some of their feelings toward teachers and avoid impulsive and rash generalizations before they could hope to establish a good working relationship.

It appeared to be one of the phenomena of the project that children would get worse before they got better. Usually the group members would become friendlier and closer to each other in the first weeks but their common bond was the fact that they were not doing too well in school. Thus, sub-groups of two's and three's would develop. In the classroom they would now whistle or throw spitballs together and thus reinforce each other against the teacher. This made life much more uncomfortable for the teacher and, of course, such sub-group behavior was directly attributable to the organization of the group. Fortunately, this phase did not usually last very long and the worker did take responsibility for pointing out to the members that this was unacceptable behavior to him as well as the teacher.

The janitor was also an important part of the team and workers sought his interest and cooperation. Occasionally this necessitated extra time for the worker to clean up and put things away properly on those occasions when the group members left too hurriedly. Frequently the boys invited the janitor to participate in the refreshment period and it was interesting to note that more friendly relationships with the janitor followed since he usually knew well those youngsters who were causing most trouble in the school.

Naturally the success of the whole project was dependent upon a cooperative approach. But since social work in general and group work in particular are not too well known by all teachers, the need for a continuing relationship was based partly upon interpretation of the method and partly upon cooperation in the interest of the child. The following examples are from discussions with one teacher:

November. "I asked her about change in any of the boys. She felt there had been no change whatever. I asked if any of the boys were getting worse. She said so far as she could observe there was not the slightest evidence of change one way or another."

January. "The principal said the teacher was definitely down on the group and would not submit any more names for referral."

March. "She said that she referred Martin to me because she felt a small group experience would do him good."

May. "She said that there was amazing progress in William's case. He asks questions thoughtfully and answers hers the same way. She said smilingly that she did not know to whom the credit belonged and then added that we were all responsible. I laughingly agreed."

No formal evaluation has been made of this project but reactions from teachers and principals, parents and boys were overwhelmingly positive. No really dramatic improvements were noted that could be attributed as such to the group experience. Yet some improvement in social relationships was noted in the case of almost every member. As pointed out earlier, some boys and parents were receiving concurrent casework services and much help accrued from this. Probably a major factor was the combined interest of a number of people in the individual child.

In the group itself, considerable social development was noted in most cases. Strong friendships within the group developed. Group members made friends with others outside the group. Turnover was very small and membership in the groups was highly valued so that in most instances change was due to transfer or moving rather than lack of interest in the group. Group cooperation, morale and solidarity did increase although group workers will recognize that movement in terms of group achievement was limited. In a group such as this the focus is primarily upon using the group in the interest of individual growth and secondarily upon achievement by the group entity. In fact, although the group was considered as a club none ever moved to the point of requiring a name, constitution, or set of officers. Program was always developed in relation to its meaning for the individual and collective programming was developed again only for the meaning this would have for the member. A minimal amount of group cohesion is, of course, essential if a group is to exist and be of meaning to the individual.

There were many requests from boys in the school to be allowed to join. Occasionally parties were held and frequently visitors were brought in by the members. The members recognized their exclusiveness both by fact of teacher referral and by criterion of being one in difficulty in school. When one visitor asked how he could join the group he was laughingly told to go crazy—then a teacher would refer him.

Actually, the scope of the project did not permit carrying it on to logical conclusions. No single group continued for more than a year. This would have been helpful and there were many requests from mem-

bers, parents, teachers, and principals to continue the project. However, when such a group is used for the benefit of providing constructive social growth for the individual it would be desirable for him to use his newly found skills in the formation of new associations outside the group. He should be permitted to invite his friends to join the group and when groups become large, splitting off of nuclei may lead to new and useful outside group experiences. When a group of disturbed individuals has grown to the point where they can form associations with so-called "normal" individuals the members may not have resolved their emotional problems but they have made greater use of their social capacities. Thus "infusion" of the group of disturbed members by so-called average individuals would be a most helpful procedure.

This description of the use of social group work in the schools is admittedly brief, biased, and limited. Little analysis has been attempted, particularly of the role of the group worker. Some of this may be evident but a fuller analysis must await another report. Suffice it to say that this project was not merely an attempt to work with individuals in a gronp but rather was directed toward a conscious and deliberate attempt to utilize the group processes in the interest of the individuals' social development. The analysis of these group processes has been briefly shown in such items as the purpose for which program was used, the nature of group influences, the use of group limitations and the relationship of worker to group as a whole. Again, while there is no magic employed here, it has not been possible in a descriptive statement to properly appraise the complexities of the interacting process as it may be guided to enhance the social growth of the individual. An example of this not discussed here is the necessity for certain regression to take place while the individual is provided with an opportunity to relive some of his aspirations and frustrations in the primary family group. Similarly the whole concept of values in the group as they relate to the cultural factors in the neighborhood and school setting have been hinted only rather than fully explored. It is important to note again that this is not a therapy group project and that whatever therapeutic values may have accrued were by-products rather than central purposes for the group. Again, this was not a recreational project, albeit many of the activities appeared recreational in nature and certainly the members had fun in the group. As noted above, the project was conceived as a means through which social relationships could be learned, with whatever capacities or limitations the boy brought to the group, through which the wise relationship of an understanding worker might help the member in his specific social adjustment to his peers and teachers in the school situation.

SCHOOL SOCIAL WORK AS IT RELATES TO COMMUNITY SERVICES[1]

ARCH THURMAN, Director, Mental Health Education
Utah State Department of Health, Fort Douglas, Utah

Ladies and Gentlemen:

My assignment today is difficult for two reasons:

1. I am not a social worker. I frequently have difficulty with your vocabulary. I am intrigued with your know how, impressed by your skills in working with children and parents and teachers.

For more years than I like to admit, I basked in the light of reflected community approval of a service department brought about by a loyal, well trained staff of school social workers.

As a layman, I may have some slight advantage in looking at school social work. I hope I can see you individually and collectively with a certain objectiveness which may be difficult for one looking at herself, and it may be that a lay person can help you see clearer your professional role in its overall relationships to social and educational problems and trends. I feel very comfortable with school social workers. I like the gleam in your eyes as you report progress on an unusually difficult problem. I like your philosophy of the helping process and your concepts of how that philosophy can be made a most effective part of school procedure.

The one discord in this appraisal however, is the fact that we outsiders often think you are better than you think you are. Self depreciation is too general among the practitioners of school social work. Humility is a cardinal virtue, but self depreciation, which says I am only a social worker, often interferes with effective relationships with parents, teachers, and administrators. Good public relations is a highly desirable quality for any person who works in a community relationship with people.

Looking at the present and the future of school social work in this country, we have reason to be optimistic. Social and Educational emphasis upon analysis of behavior, and the growth of individual per-

[1] Presented at the 82nd Annual Forum, National Conference of Social Work, San Francisco, June, 1955.

sonality has built a platform upon which school social work can operate in a community setting with full community approval and in full view of the public who support these services. In accepting this center of the stage position, school social work will do well to reassert its leadership in inter-agency and inter-disciplinary cooperation. No claim of superior skills, or the assumption of prior rights will endear school social work services to the public or to the professional personnel of the community. The services of school social work in a community will continue to be approved only as those services are integrated and accepted by the community as a part of the educational and community plans to meet the needs of the children in the community.

The second problem arises out the nature of the assignment "School Social Work as it relates to Community Services". I accepted this assignment with more than the usual amount of enthusiasm. I am enthusiastic about the community as the fulcrum by which educational, social and health conditions can be lifted to higher levels. America can be great only as communities are great. After a bit of digging into some basic thinking about social work in relation to community problems, and especially the function of school social work, I submitted an outline to a social work consultant for *evaluation*. After scanning a page or two, she gave me the Sherlock Holmes' famous, "Elementary, my dear Watson, Elementary." She explained that the structnre and content of social work in community settings is part of the prescribed curriculum in social work education. "The concept of inter-agency cooperation is basic social work training."

Because you who have had this training accept the philosophy and the structure of school social work in its community setting, my hope is that I can add a little to your appreciation of this concept by narrating the development of the process as it grew like Topsy in a small western community.

This paper will in the main be based upon a description of plans, experience and dreams developed largely through the wisdom of a staff of united and well trained school social workers, as they combined their theories of social work with a good bit of practical common sense.

Five basic assumptions might help us see school social work as it is related to community services.

1. School social work is accepted by the professions as a recognized and important specialty in the field of social work. This recognition by

the social work and teaching professions has come about gradually during the past half century.

2. This acceptance has been stepped up during the past half dozen years, due in large part to the leadership of your national organization and the devotion of those leaders in the field of school social work, who have given so freely of their time and wisdom. Social work in the school setting necessarily places emphasis upon working relationships with other community agencies interested in the same child. Early in the development of School Social Work programs, it was recognized that many children about whom the school was concerned, were active with health and welfare agencies of the community. How to work out professional relationships among agencies involved with the same child or family became, and is, a major concern in many school service departments.

3. Among the approximately 500 city school systems in which there is an established social service department, there is an almost universal acceptance of modern educational philosophy which places personality development of the individual child high among the purposes of education. How children feel is infinitely more important than what they learn. School social work services cannot function satisfactorily in a static educational philosophy based too rigidly upon content of subject and rigid look-stop classification.

4. School social workers are, by the very nature of their responsibilities, more deeply involved with the community than many other specialties or disciplines. In many ways Public Education involves all the people of the community. Such public involvement implies interest of organized groups, as they reflect the feelings of the public with whom they are working.

5. School social work must frequently function in an authoritative setting—school attendance is a positive legal mandate. Much of what goes on in school organization cannot be permissive. Many school administrators contribute to an excessively authoritative and rigid atmosphere by their own need to control—it is recognized that this setting in which school social work is functioning has much to do with the need of cooperative relationships with other social agencies.

These obvious assumptions are repeated here as staging, in which our discussion of School Social Work in a community setting can be better seen.

Good social service administrators, it seems to me, like good school

administration requires that the administrative head of a school service agency participate and encourage his staff to participate in community activities which are related to welfare of children. Acceptance of responsibility in directing welfare or other community councils, work on committees of those councils, joint staff meetings, case conferences, research and other community activities may well be thought of as a major responsibility of executive and staff members in any well organized school social service department—it might well be considered a regular part of the assignment of staff members and executive, and time allocated to this activity.

There are still those in the profession who would avoid these responsibilities under pretext that "I am too busy," or suggest that this kind of service is not the kind of service which the Board of Education is paying the staff to perform. With such staff members I would raise the question of the breadth of their comprehension. Their place in the educational and social structure of the community should find its level of blind, dull, uncreative monotony. To the lay person or to Board members who believe that cooperative work by the professional staff with health and welfare agencies of the community is outside the functions of the school social worker, I would talk actual cold cash values, as well as the deeper but more intangible benefits. I would enumerate the great dividends.

Let me illustrate:

A dozen years ago, during the height of World War II, when emotional tensions and employment opportunities were at their peak, Salt Lake City became concerned about the increasing absenteeism among Junior and Senior High School pupils. Delinquency was showing a definite upsurge.

A statistical study of non-attendance and related problems of delinquency and illegal employment was made by the staff of the Department of Pupil Personnel. Summaries of these data were presented to the Board of Education, to the Welfare Council, to the Juvenile Court and to the City Commission. A general community wide committee of 30 interested citizens was called by joint authorities of the City Government and The Board of Education to look at this specific problem of school non-attendance and its by-products. At this meeting, among others were the Mayor, the Chief of Police, the Judges of Juvenile and District Courts, the Superintendent of Schools, President of the Board of Education, Principals, Deans and Counselors of all secondary schools,

representatives of the Welfare Council, the Chamber of Commerce, the State Industrial Commission, and all staff members of the Department of Pupil Personnel.

For three hours this community wide committee looked at these community problems as they clustered about this specific problem of school attendance.

Out of this community thinking and planning came the following tangible results:

1. The Chief of Police "challenged" the Superintendent of Schools to match one educator with one police officer to form teams of two to cover the city during the following week to determine the extent of illegal absence from school. Fifty such teams were organized and for a week a police officer and a Principal or Dean or Counselor or staff member of the Department of Pupil Personnel did cover the city, visiting stores, pool halls, parks, playgrounds, all business establishments employing minors, streets and alleys where youngsters would likely be found. The teams were to bring in all youths of school age who were out of school without legal authorization. During this week of survey, about 300 pupils or 60 per day were found to be out of school without a legitimate excuse. All were brought in to the Public Safety Building or to the Administration Building of the Board of Education, where they were detained until their parents came for them. These parents were interviewed by the social work staffs of the Department of Pupil Personnel, the Courts and the community agencies. Many parents came with considerable hostility at being inconvenienced. Most of them went home with more understanding of their child's behavior and a determination to do something about it.

2. Because of this "survey" the Chief of Police instructed all patrolmen to be interested in youth of school age who seem to be on the loose and if no satisfactory explanation of absence from school could be given, to take such child or youth to the School Administration Building. This service has continued to the present time, and so far as school attendance is concerned, is equivalent to added staff in the Department of Pupil Personnel.

3. Because of their awareness of the "youth problem", the City Commission at this time created a Youth Bureau which was given specific responsibility for law enforcement affecting youth under 18 years of age. This Bureau was staffed by young officers especially selected for their interest in young people and their understanding of behavior. The

Bureau immediately affiliated with the Welfare Council, its staff attended regular joint meetings with staffs of the schools, courts and social agencies concerned with youth problems. Two women officers were added to this Bureau. The cooperative working together of the Youth Bureau, the Department of Pupil Personnel, the Juvenile Court, and the Welfare and Health Agencies, has become one of the bright spots in community organization.

4. The Juvenile Court took an increased interest in problems which are related to the schools and established a policy that all cases involving juveniles or their parents in which school problems are a major or contributing cause of court action, a school social worker will be summoned to court as an advisor to the court and a friend to the accused juvenile.

5. An outgrowth of this community study and planning together was the development of a monthly meeting of the entire staffs of all agencies, public and private, involved in working with children and youth. These monthly meetings have continued to the present time and constitute one of the most dynamic forces in the community toward improvement of services to children and youth.

The week's intensive survey of non-attendance was not established as a continuing procedure. It was not necessary. The interest aroused in the community, among the agencies and parents has continued. School attendance on the secondary level rose spectacularly. It has remained in the high 90's ever since.

No one would assume that these social improvements came about primarily from this meeting or from the week of survey, but we can maintain that these growths resulted from a community awareness of a community problem and that the school social workers in the Department of Pupil Personnel had the role of leadership in developing this awareness and promoting these social improvements. Community participation is always a valuable tool in bringing school social work services and community services into a close working relationship. It has served an additional purpose of good public relations by letting agencies, public officials, and the staff of the Pupil Personnel Department know each other, the areas of interests and responsibility each assumes, and to re-emphasize the point of view of the department that each school social worker individually and as a staff member, must be a real part of the community.

In answer to money-minded cynics who wondered why the Board of Education should pay the salaries of director and social workers who spend a good part of their time in meetings, we can point to the added services which the schools and their patrons are receiving as a result of community planning and cooperative working together. Such added services are almost equivalent to doubling the social work staff of the service department. It is further evident that the work with the regular case loads and other routine responsibilities of the staff was not lessened but was more effectively done.

The problem of the working relationships between school social workers and other community agencies interested in the same children is one that most other social service departments must deal with. Many have worked out procedures under which they maintain good working relationships with other social agencies. Some have not, and are constantly having little annoyances with agency personnel.

School social workers have had ample opportunity to recognize this problem as it relates to their own experience. A very common need for clarification of procedures and the establishment of cooperative working relationship in most communities is illustrated by Juvenile Court legal procedures and practices as they affect school children. For a number of years, the Juvenile Court and its Probation Department would completely ignore the social evaluations made by the school social worker prior to referral to the Court. Carefully written case records were kept by the school Social Service Department. Psychological examinations were available, but for some unaccountable reason, the Court and Probation Department made no use of this data. Perhaps it was tied up to a legal mandate in the Juvenile Court code that the Probation Department of the Court make an investigation and report to the Court prior to court hearing on all filed petitions. At any rate, when petition was filed, the probation officer started from scratch and in so far as he had time and skill, he duplicated the case records already on file in the Pupil Personnel Department, which formed the basis for referral to court. Tension between the court staff and the school social workers mounted to the point that no referrals to the court were being made by the school social workers.

In 1947 the staffs of the Juvenile Court, the Salt Lake City Department of Pupil Personnel, and the Youth Bureau of the Salt Lake City Police Department developed a plan of procedure which clarified the professional responsibilities and relationships of each service and eliminated this duplication of effort.

This document, which was the result of staff conferences and committee work during the major part of a year, comprises ten type-written pages and has set a pattern for many other inter-agency agreements.

The report consisted of five sections which outlined in detail the procedure of referral from school social service to the Juvenile Court; responsibility of the court probation worker and the school social worker; definition of roles of agencies and workers concerned; relationship of other agencies on school—court cases; responsibility and procedure on cases involving police action. The report included as its first division a statement of general principles. It is somewhat amazing that a court of law and a police department participated in the development of these basic principles.

1. That case workers in all agencies follow the accepted practices of sound social case work.

2. That the function of each agency be clearly outlined, understood and accepted.

3. That the role of the case worker and other personnel concerned with inter-agency relationships be defined, and the administrator of each assume responsibility to see that all employees work within this framework.

In school cases, more than other types, it is often necessary that more than one agency have specific functions and relationships in the handling of a case. It is, however, accepted procedure that workers from more than one agency shall not be active on a case except as a result of case conferences by the agencies involved and common agreement as to the role and function of each worker. In case of misunderstanding or further need for interpretation of the role, function or policy of the worker or agency, clarification should be through the respective heads of the agencies involved.

Similar written agreements were worked out with all major social agencies who were involved with children of school age. At this point I want to recognize with you that there is nothing new or novel about this community cooperation. Most cities having school social work services can duplicate and excel this record. The significant fact to me, and I hope to you, is that all these social advances and improvements of working together were the product of efforts initiated by school social workers—may I re-emphasize this point. Those improvements came about through the efforts of school social workers—not the Welfare

Council, or the department head or the School Administrator, or the Graduate School of Social Work, but by the continuous untiring efforts of a united, devoted staff of school social workers whose only objective was improved services for the children and families of the community.

Another responsibility of school social workers in a community is to see that the disadvantaged children and families are helped as needed. Often the best kind of help to a family is to put them in contact with agencies or public services which can supply their needs. There are, however, borderline cases for which no such help is available. Through the use of resources not specifically set up for health and welfare problems, the school social worker can provide substantial assistance to borderline families whose children would probably be denied health, welfare and educational services without such assistance.

In most cities service clubs, women's organizations, Parent Teacher Associations, foundations, churches, fraternal groups, and many more community organizations have special interests and projects for the health and welfare of children. This is good—as a resource. It may not be good.

The role of the school social worker in this area is to help organize and direct these resources in such a way that the best possible use can be made of them in the interest of the children most in need. Some may doubt that organizations will use the school social worker in this way. The spirit of the "do gooder" may not respond to direction, but experience has shown that patience and good public relations will bring about whole hearted cooperation.

In Salt Lake City, the Kiwanis Club will accept children for complete medical and dental care, including surgery, but only on recommendation of a staff member of the Department of Pupil Personnel. Last year this service club gave more than $5,000 in medical and surgical services, all of which was channeled through the school social worker. They name her in their roster as *their* social worker. Plans were worked out with other organizations by which school children are provided with shoes, eye glasses, emergency clothing, and many of the physical needs necessary to keep children in school. In each case the school social worker is the source of referral. Coordination, cooperation and direction are as necessary in this area as in the casework relationship. Here the school social worker is a natural to direct this flow of resources to the best advantage of children needing help.

In a 1952 study titled, "School Social Work and Coordination of Inter-Agency Activities," Miss Vera L. Christensen summarizes her research as follows:

As a conclusion to the research carried out in this study, the following general concepts seem pertinent:

1. The working relationship of the school social worker with the community agency social worker must, in the interest of effective service to the child who is having difficulty in school, be a *collaborative* relationship; each worker sharing responsibility within the limits of his agency function.

2. Collaboration can only be accomplished if there is a mutual understanding and trust in each other as persons and in the service that each has to offer.

3. Joint staff meetings enhance professional working relationships.

4. A working knowledge of community resources and how to use them is an essential part of effective school social work practice.

5. Participation of school social workers in community councils, council committees and community activities is an effective means of interpreting the school to the community and the community to the school. It is a desirable method of promoting continuous, progressive and satisfactory relationships.

The opening paragraph in a recently revised publication of Community Chests and Councils entitled, "Team Work in Our Town," says:

Not long ago a young German re-discovered America. A refugee from Fascism, he had found work here in a social agency. Coming back from a community council meeting one day, he had a gleam of excitement in his eye. "I have just discovered what is so great about America," he cried. "In Germany when something was wrong in the community we would say, "Why doesn't the government *do* something about it?" Here when something is wrong we say, "Why don't *WE* do something about it?"

The development of school social work services has been largely confined to the larger city school systems. Some beginnings are being undertaken to develop state wide school social work services, but throughout most of the nation, rural schools and rural school systems are without the services of school social workers.

The White House Conference of 1950 pointed up the needs of help for children and youth in rural areas as well as in urban districts. "For every child a wholesome personality" became meaningful as a part of the educational philosophy in many rural areas. This philosophy was stimulated further by the following recommendation coming out of the Conference:

"That the citizens of every community accept responsibility for providing and maintaining adequate progress and facilities with professional personnel for education, health, and social services, and that in the development of such programs, full and appropriate use be made of all voluntary and public resources; and that communities foster cooperative community bodies representative of all community interests to study and advance better conditions and opportunities for children and youth."

Two additional social factors have recently tended to multiply the trend in rural communities toward a more individualized educational philosophy.

1. We are at present riding the crest of a wave of interest in Mental Health. National organizations, both public and private, have turned the spotlight on America's number one health problem. This spotlight revealed unusual areas of interest which became personal as well as professional. The facts that more than one-half of all hospital beds in the nation are occupied by mentally ill patients and that more children now in the elementary schools of America will sometime during their lives be treated for emotional disorders than will graduate from college, not only became frightening but became the stimulus for professional educators and social workers to stop, look and listen to what is happening to children in their own community.

Almost over night research in all aspects of mental health and all related facets of emotional development became a crusade. Out of this vast maize of research two very practical conclusions stand out:

(A) Mental Health is obtainable by definite specific understandable rules of living with one's self and with other people.

(B) Of the estimated five million children now in public school who seem to be headed for clinical psychiatric treatment, one-half can be prevented if the homes and the schools will cooperatively work to provide the basic needs of children.

Here is a tremendous community opportunity for school social workers. Her skills and experience in human dynamics and the use of resources marks her as one of the key figures in the promotion of mental health in the community.

2. During the crest of interest in this number one health problem, America was awakened to find itself facing—not a wave of juvenile delinquency—but actually a flood. People became inquisitive about behavior. These and other related social factors developed in many rural areas a felt need for help in understanding and interpreting behavior as it relates to school and home and to community.

Two years ago the State Department of Health in Utah established a Division of Mental Health Education. That division undertook a four point program of helping rural areas. The program involved:

1. Public awareness of the incidence and causes of mental illness, the principles of mental health, the needs of children in school and home, and some basic concepts of behavior.

2. Helps to teachers, individually or in groups, with their problems and anxieties concerning behavior, health, capacities, and family influences of children with whom they are working.

3. Casework services and psychological services in the interest of children referred for clinical help by a school or agency.

4. Helps to communities in identification of their needs, what are the resources in the community to meet these needs, what additional helps are required and how these additional services can be secured.

As plans for this program unfolded, it became evident that in each of these areas the skill of a well trained school social worker was indicated, or at least a well trained social worker with knowledge and experience in school relationships. After two years of research and evaluation, it is still evident that to meet these community needs the core of the program is the social worker.

Typical of experimental work in rural areas is work done in a medium sized county school district, 250 miles from the State Capitol. The Superintendent of Schools was very anxious for help. The community was not well oriented into the problems of the emotional lives of children. A representative group was selected by the Superintendent to sit down and plan for the type and amount of help which seemed to be most needed. They planned and developed a program of awareness of needs. This reached every part of the county. More than half of all adults in the county attended mental health meetings. In addition the usual media of communication were involved. With this preparation the communities felt they were ready to move to the next step—specific helps for disturbed children. After sessions with all the teachers of the district, a clinical team of school social workers (borrowed from agencies in Salt Lake City) and clinical psychologists worked for three days on referrals screened from teacher through principal and supervisor to the public health nurse.

The psychologists were involved in a clinical evaluation of the child and during this time, the school social workers were working with

the teacher most concerned with the child and with the parent. At the end of this counseling clinic, the "cases" were staffed and the child was evaluated—as seen by the clinical psychological examination, as seen by the teacher, and as seen in his home and community interpreted by the school social worker from her interview with the parents.

Psychological evaluation by the psychologist, together with social histories and observations by the school social worker, were sent to the Superintendent of Schools who had been carefully prepared for proper use of this evaluation and observations. The same clinic team returned for further conferences with the same teachers and parents concerning the same child at regular intervals throughout the year. At the end of the experimental study, the community committee and the clinic team sat down to an honest objective evaluation and a look into the future. The evaluation was positive. Without exception parents, teachers, local physicians, and school administrators reported positive improvement in the child's relationships and school adjustment. One teacher, without knowing it, expressed one of the basic aims of school social work. She had referred Teddy, eight years old, for thumb-sucking, extreme shyness, a non-learner and a "baby". The psychological evaluation indicated Teddy had better than average ability, but there were some indications of neurological damage. The school social worker was able to develop a picture of a completely inadequate and hostile home. Teddy's problems were rooted deeply in the home and community rejection. A conference between school social worker and the teacher followed these clinical findings. On the next visit, the social worker inquired as to how Teddy was getting along. The teacher without realizing the significance of her reply, said, "Teddy hasn't changed much, but I have. I can stand him now because I see why he is as he is."

The following positive results to that school district followed the year of demonstration and evaluation:

1. A traveling unit of the Psychiatric Clinic was established at the request of the community. Badly disturbed children referred by the school social worker were seen by this psychiatric clinic team.

2. This rural county is now planning to employ its own full time school social worker and school psychologist.

3. Under the leadership of its community planning committee, this county is now in a position to go forward in a program of research into its other needs and to plan an action program to meet these needs.

4. The enthusiasm with which this demonstration of services was received by this school district has spread to other areas so that there is throughout the State an increased demand for help from school districts.

5. School social work services have been interpreted by discussion and demonstration to one of the key school administrators of the State whose enthusiasm is contagious.

In attempting to evaluate this trend toward securing school social work services in rural areas, we must see these services in relationship to the total educational program. The employment of a social worker will not, in itself, be the answer to community problems. How the school social worker views her role in the community and how the community accepts her will determine the effectiveness of her services.

A primary responsibility of school social workers in the community is to work with all the people of the community to promote the general welfare. Promotion of the general welfare of a community can best be accomplished by complete well-integrated cooperation among all organizations having responsibilities for the health and welfare of children.

No educator has a right to make a major decision involving future educational plans for children with whom social agencies are working without consultation and cooperative planning by all those who are professionally involved in the welfare of these children. No Judge or staff member of a Juvenile Court should assume the right to deal with delinquent behavior without taking advantage of the accumulated knowledge and experience of all those who have had professional working relationships with the delinquent youth and his family. Health problems must be considered as a cooperative venture of all who are concerned with the total emotional and physical setting in which the child is living.

One of the serious deterrents to a satisfactory community welfare program is petty jealousies among agencies and professional personnel who often assume a sort of proprietorship in certain areas of education, health or welfare of the people. Small threatened people often compensate by over-emphasis upon their prerogatives and authority. Certainly in this problem the school social worker has a great stake. She, more than most, must live in her every day relationships, with proper channeling and assignments of responsibilities. This participation in community affairs has done more to give the schools and social work status than any other thing during the past decade. In Salt Lake City it is no longer only an educator or only a social worker but due largely to wise

thoughtful cooperative planning, the professions of social work and education are today high among the respected professions.

I am optimistic for the future. I have deep and abiding faith that school social work services will grow both quantitatively and qualitatively. I think we can look forward to the time when all children and youth will have equal chances for good health, good education and good guidance. I choose to believe that we are near the time when we shall all recognize the school social worker as a key person in the affairs of our schools and local communities, and that we all have a responsibility for the effectiveness of community planning.

I have faith that intelligence will replace ignorance in high places and that government will give primacy to the needs of all the children and to the quality of services related to these needs.

I hope we all can see the advantages of working together and that we shall reject leadership which is too blind to see this advantage.

As a profession, you in school social work, must have faith in the people and in yourselves. You must not only believe in the importance of school social work services but that it is you who make these services important. Be courageous in defending your belief in the philosophy upon which school social work is predicated—and show the effectiveness of that philosophy by your actions in behalf of the child who is disadvantaged.

It is my deep conviction that our hope lies in the local community. As our local communities are strong, so the state and nation are strong. It is in our local communities where our school social work services must justify their worth. It is, therefore, most vital to the success of school social work that all the people of the community understand the total problems and the total resources with which you are working. You must be in active partnership with those who are recipients of your helping process and also those who pay the check. Such partnership will not only demonstrate the process of democracy in action but will actually add to the strength and prestige of the services. People plus problems plus process equals planning. It is the inter-relationships of these factors with which school social workers must be most concerned. Our hope is that through the process of helping people work together as individuals and as groups, school social work services will be elevated even higher as one of the learned profession, and the acceptance and understanding of your services by the people will be your best source of security.

Once more I salute you social workers as individuals and as a pro-

fession. Because of the character of your professional work, you must aspire to live above the fog of hate and ill will and jealousy. You who respond to the needs of the helpless and the discouraged must work and pray and love and serve as best you can. Your greatest happiness must be to call the roll of those you have helped and inspired and encouraged. You, more than any one else, can replace fear and distrust with faith and love and hope and joy. You who would put new hope into a child whose life is filled with discouragement and inspire a youth to achieve a nobler life are the real designers of the coming years.

In the reflected light of a well spent life, the great Thomas A. Edison shortly before his death said,

"Problems of human engineering will receive, during the coming years, the same genius and attention which the 19th century gave to the more material forms of engineering."

THE SCHOOL SOCIAL WORKER HELPS THE CHILD THROUGH COLLABORATION WITH OTHER SCHOOL PERSONNEL[1]

JANE WILLE, Consultant, Education for Exceptional Children
Visiting Social Counselors, State of Illinois

Understanding and knowledge derived from other disciplines and skill in application of such knowledge to the education process is vitally important to education today. Increasingly schools have recognized this fact as they have utilized the services of personnel whose training is in the field of medicine, psychiatry, nursing, psychology, and social work. Yet, the services of these disciplines have become an integral part of the school only insofar as school personnel have gained support and have benefited from the knowledge, skills, and application of their contribution and have been able to utilize the findings in the school program. It is important to emphasize that individual services are a vital part of the educational structure to the extent that they enrich and facilitate the educational process and contribute to removing or modifying the factors which interfere with learning—as conceived in the present day usage of the term—that is learning which includes emotional aspects of academic achievement and social aspects of the child's relations in the school setting.

Collaboration within the school setting is unique in some respects. Without attempting a complete analysis of the characteristics of the setting which help to maintain its uniqueness, I would like to refer briefly to some of the factors which seem to be peculiar to the school and which pose problems in attempting effective collaboration.

Traditionally, educators have been leaders in testing out theories concerning the relationship between learning and child development. The lag between educational theory and practice is well recognized by educators themselves. Yet leading school administrators have been concerned with the prevalent lack of consideration on the part of teachers for the needs of the child. This is particularly true at the secondary level where teachers have a reputation for being "subject-minded". Without

[1] Presented at the 82nd Annual Forum, National Conference of Social Work, San Francisco, June, 1955.

digressing into a defense of teachers, there are adequate reasons to account for such attitudes. However, as education has attempted to supplement the services of the classroom teacher, there has been difficulty in assimilating these school services into the total educational structure. "Specialists" not from the field of education have been viewed with suspicion on the part of many teachers. School social workers are familiar with a rather prevalent teacher attitude concerning specialists in the schools. This attitude might be characterized by, "Well, what can *you* do about it?" Our aim must be an effort to attain a spirit of collaboration in which this comment can become, "Well, what can *we* do about it?"

Faced with this dilemma of education assuming leadership in interpreting the relationship between learning and child development and the understandable lag in practice, how can school social workers contribute towards effecting a more skilled coordination of services designed to help children? First, it is essential for all persons working with individual children in the school to gain a respect for the purpose of the school, the organizational structure designed to achieve the fulfillment of the educational purpose and the place of their own particular service in relation to the total services. Intellectual understanding of the purpose of other services and some appreciation of the difficulties supplementary service personnel encounter in their efforts to adapt their service to the school setting is imperative. In addition to the attainment of an intellectual understanding it is also necessary to attain an emotional maturity through which an effective professional inter-relationship can be achieved. Such maturity presupposes having arrived at a respect for the potential and an acceptance of the limitations of social work service within the school. Such maturity also encompasses a capacity to understand and to give understanding in a manner which permits its use within the framework of the school.

If we have respect for our knowledge and skill and make it freely, warmly, and appropriately available to others, it usually follows that we will respect the contribution of others. Such respect is vital to the achievement of effective interdisciplinary functioning. It facilitates a working climate in which meaningful sharing may take place. Recently, an educational counselor in a large suburban high school commented on the helpfulness of a school social worker who had enabled her to work more effectively with a student. She said that she had been fearful of the school social worker's coming into the school as a specialist, but had been happy to find that she had something to offer others in their rela-

tionships with students. This quality of sharing without necessarily "taking over" stems from a comfortableness about one's own role and an interest in helping others to function in a more satisfying way in their day to day contacts.

In contrast to this, sometimes in our preoccupation with our own work, we lose perspective and fail to be aware of the total school structure with its multiple inter-relationships. We may become a bit possessive in our attitude toward the children known to us. When we assume a possessive attitude, we tend to expect other people—principals, teachers, clerks—to keep us informed of every incident which affects the child with whom we are working. Sharing of information is essential, but it is definitely a two-way process. Often the school social worker must take the initiative to approach other school people. In the process of sharing information and understanding, we often gain the interest of another school person who may serve as an important influence in a child's school environment. This is desirable, but it takes considerable maturity to further the process and not to dwell on the specific contribution which we are making but to be willing to share the child and be receptive to possible use of other resources.

In considering methods of collaboration, knowledge of a feasible plan and timing should be considered. When it is possible to have a referral conference in which teacher, guidance worker, nurse, school social worker or others are concerned, they may consider the nature of the problem and tentatively decide who should assume major responsibility and the beginning work with a child may have a favorable start. Later, a planning conference may be desirable to consider the progress made and whether other factors call for use of additional school or community resources or transfer to another service. Initially, a problem of a child may appear to be a health problem, but on further exploration, we may learn that physical symptoms have an emotional basis or that the physical symptom masks a more serious problem. Recently, a school nurse brought to the visiting school counselor's attention the problem of a boy who appeared to be quite ill and yet feared to go home because of the over-concern which his mother would show. This boy has been struggling to protect himself against the over-dependent relationship which his mother has fostered and needs help to strengthen his own healthy impulse to grow as a person. Timely cooperative work between the nurse and school social worker may give this child help at such a critical period of his development.

Cooperative work among the various disciplines within the school

depends to a large degree on the understanding and support of the school administrator. The administrator must help each of the disciplines to define its function in the school and the way in which it will work so that there can be a clear understanding on the part of all school personnel. It is important too that the administrator develop channels for collaborative work and that he participate in conferences with special service personnel.

Collaboration, or "what can *we* do about it?", begins in work with the classroom teacher. Unless the teacher is functioning as part of the team, knowledge and skills of the other disciplines may fail to be utilized effectively or at least yield only partial benefits to the child. A teacher's concern about a particular child's behavior, personality, or learning problem is usually the point at which supplementary services are considered. When the problem the child presents appears to lie appropriately within the responsibility of one of the "special" services, the decision as to the service requested frequently is an administrative one, often reached through the teacher's consultation with a principal. If there is a Director of Special Education or Director of Guidance, referrals may channel through the teacher or principal to such an administrator. Procedures or referral are usually carefully worked out in order to include the school social worker in the original decision as to the appropriateness of referral to this service. Underlying this brief description of a typical method of referral are sound principles which respect the role of the teacher in the referral process. If, as occasionally is true, the referral originates with the concern of a principal, parent, or other referral source, the first consideration is the meaning of this referral to the teacher. How does she see the child in school? If he has been experiencing difficulties, how has she attempted to help him? Is she ready to use the help of an auxiliary service, or is it more timely to offer opportunities for the teacher to discuss the child with the school social worker. Perhaps this kind of consultative service rather than direct service is indicated.

As part of the initial process of collaboration, it is important for the teacher to share her concerns with the school social worker if a decision to use this service is reached. This initial discussion with the teacher permits an examination of academic records, past achievement and psychological tests and shared professional thinking concerning the nature of the present difficulty. The beginning conference with the teacher also permits two professional workers to consider what they, one as a teacher and one as a school social worker, may offer a particular child so that his school life may become a more productive experience.

The school social worker has a responsibility to define the specifics of his focus as a school social worker. He also has a responsibility to establish a working relationship which frees the teacher to use her understanding and skill as a teacher in relation to this child. The potential of the cooperative working relationship or collaboration between teacher and school social worker is realized as both share their knowledge and understanding in such a manner that each contributes more fully to the social, emotional and intellectual development of the child. Sometimes in the conference with the teacher there will be a joint decision to use other services. In such cases this may most effectively be done in a conference. Sometimes, however, the school social worker may take the responsibility for consulting with the school psychologist, nurse, speech teacher or educational guidance counselor to bring related facts and possible contributing factors into the present study and analysis of the problem.

Collaboration is sometimes done in our direct work with a child. We may, for instance, recognize the desirability of using another school service. This process may be effected in a helpful way through interpretation to the student and to the other special service persons. For example, as school social workers, we frequently talk with students who are seeking changes in schedules. With some of these students, it is obvious that request for schedule change represents a self-dissatisfaction which is projected onto teachers and subjects. In these instances, the school social worker attempts to help the student to gain some insight into his pattern of behavior and to modify this pattern. When the need for change seems valid because of reality conditions, the social worker has a responsibility to interpret the need, as he sees it, to the guidance counselor. It is also desirable to help the student take the initiative to make his request directly to the counselor.

The school social worker, in his training, has ample opportunity to learn about the use of many resources in helping individuals and to learn methods of collaboration. Since such content is not usually included to the same degree in the training of other specialists who practice in the schools, it seems incumbent upon the school social worker to assume some leadership in developing collaborative methods and demonstrating through his own work the skills which make collaboration effective.

CHILDREN WITH ANTI-SCHOOL PATTERNS[1]

JOHN G. MILNER, Associate Professor
School of Social Work, University of Southern California

For some children, school looms up as a giant obstacle standing square in the way of their being able to make the only kind of social adjustment that they might feel can never be a satisfactory one for them. They tend to see this institution as a hindrance to their happiness. In some cases it is true that the school itself can serve as the obstruction, in others it serves merely as the point of focus to be blamed for causation coming from elsewhere in the child's experience. Regardless of the true source of the child's happiness, he can honestly feel that his resentments and hurts stem from school, and it is here that his trouble rests.

During the very first years of life, the child does not meet society directly. It is met through the medium of the parents or others caring for him. These persons represent what is the social structure to the child. While parents are influenced by the social structure within which they live, many of them do not accurately represent this to their children by the methods of education and training which they use. Theirs may be a kind of authority which is not prevailing. The child of such parents then gets an inaccurate conception of society and particularly the kind of authority currently in practice in larger society.

While such a child is limited to the society of the home, he knows only that which his parents choose to teach him out of their relationship with him. His adaptive mechanisms help him to adjust only to the circumstances he knows. Certain children are unfortunate to meet first, the kind of authority that tends to break their will, to kill their spontaneity and their independence. While such children generally put up a fight against this, many are defeated in their strife for freedom from parental pressures and to be themselves.

Other children may experience a family situation where there is little or no authority. They are raised without the experience of a defined social structure serving to set limits for them. They may know only what might be termed a false freedom. These are extremes in the authority of home, however it is from the experience of such extremes

[1] Presented at the 82nd Annual Forum of the National Conference of Social Work, June, 1955.

that the source of trouble later manifested in school seems to stem for many children.

For most American youngsters, school serves as their second major social experience. Here they meet a kind of society alone and away from their parents. The school serves as a new authority and often one that is extremely different from the one experienced with parents. This includes not only adult authority, but also that of the pressures coming from the child's own group of contemporaries.

The extension of experience from home into school places the child in the position of needing to adjust and adapt to difference, and at the same time, to sustain his relationships at home. The personality pattern for his adaptation at home he may find to be inappropriate and inadequate to the social situation he meets at school. This difference demands of him that he either change himself to adapt to his new situation or meet with defeat. He finds that he is called upon to be flexible enough as a personality to live in two situations that are different, home and school. Furthermore he discovers that his parents want and expect him to get along in both places, even when the inconsistencies may be very great. This puts new demands on him to use himself in a far more complicated way than he has previously known.

Time permitting, and with patient, constant, and adequate support from adult authority in both places, most children manage to bridge this gap without experiencing the scars of defeat. An uncertain number, however, are defeated in their efforts. Some of these are the ones who come to regard school as the source of their personal troubles.

To illustrate the difficulty in transcending the two social institutions of home and school, consider the child who has been raised by parents who have imposed a kind of authority that has served to paralyze his originality and spontaneity. His personality has become absorbed by his parents who have perhaps innocently brought about a form of slavish dependence upon them. He has never been allowed the opportunity to develop a real self, he has become only the sum total of the expectations of others about him. He therefore functions only as a pseudo-self.

His absorption by the parents might have been achieved by various means of dominance and control that served as an arbitrary imposition of an authority that was irrational and absolute. It may be particularly the kind of authority that caused him to feel guilt and to repress any hostility out of the fear of losing the parental love.

Such a child's reconciliation with his parents depends on his obedience and love for them, thus repressing in a compulsive way, his self-will to ever disobey or to hate them. Such a child has gotten along well at home because he learned to be comfortable by being obedient and devoted. In the situation of school he finds that this same pattern of behavior that has seemingly served him well at home will lead to his defeat. In school, he must be assertive at some point in order to make meaningful relationships and to achieve. It is not enough that he just be obedient and devoted. In the beginning, he may desperately try to stabilize his relationships on the basis of his earlier conditioning. When this fails him and he makes an effort to compete, he will find that his guilt and his feelings of anxiety will become exaggerated. In his way of thinking and feeling, his assertiveness must be wrong; school demands this of him so school is "bad". He has not been able to establish an integrated self-conception that is appropriate for his age. He only knows himself as he is with his parents who have taught him in many ways that aggression is bad. In school, he must be on his own and he has little that is his own.

Here he suffers a conflict between the initial adjustment of submissiveness and his new assumption of goals for achievement which requires certain independent action. Such a child might be able to rally the needed personal strength to achieve these goals if his world at home remained separate and constant, but this is usually not the case.

When parents see their child making fumbling efforts to get along in school they tend to ridicule these because the child is not meeting their expectations for adequacy. His failure in school will reflect their failure as parents. They are badly threatened by this. The child then finds that his striving to adapt himself to conflicting expectations is painful, both because it violates his initial submissive adjustment and because the pressures from both home and school to make change seem to him to be unreasonable and even impossible. He feels failure, yet to give up would cause him guilt for not making the effort to achieve. He is caught in his contradictory behavior and so he suffers. To him, the obvious cause for all this seems to be the fact that he is compelled to go to school. His feelings about school then grow into hate.

American educators have long recognized the difficulties for some children to make their first adjustment to school. Out of this recognition and awareness they have created a situation of sympathy and understanding for the children coming to the primary grades. Teachers of beginners are commonly selected because of their warmth and under-

standing, along with their ability to accept some difference in children. They then try to help them gradually adapt themselves to the routine and authority of school. While children are helped to develop as individuals, some primary teachers, out of their concern for those who don't adapt themselves, tend to smother the child by doing things for him, giving him careful direction, overly protecting him. Teachers then feel satisfied when the child settles in to just obeying them and being devoted. The activities of the child's own group, at this age, are carefully supervised and directed by adults so that even here the child can get along if he is devoted and obedient. Thus the real need to be an individual in one's own right can get delayed even into the later years of grade school. Because of this the pattern of dependency is perpetuated. This may explain why many serious problems in school tend to get delayed beyond the primary grades. What has appeared, all along, to have been a good adjustment has only been the adaptation of the child's pseudo-self to his school as well as his home. Only when the demands are greater that he be an assertive and real person will his conflicts be incised and trouble will ensue. By the time this delayed action toward school gets expressed, the child has developed an established pattern of thinking and feeling against school—an anti-school mentality.

This pattern can be so fixated as to cause him to resist development. His resistance can get expressed in overt manifest conduct disorders and disturbances or in repressed and disguised ways. The child projects the blame for his self-limitations onto the school, yet knowing that he himself is inadequate. With such a child, help must be directed to uncover specific fears, to release emotions without the accompanying guilt and to reinforce the child's efforts to achieve.

The opposite extreme of the undisciplined child often finds the situation of school to be a sudden and overwhelming control that threatens to trap him and train him. His conflict, then, is immediately with his environment. He feels that he is faced with the need to stay away from school, remain in school and spend his energies on leveling the controls, or to resign himself to a life of misery, marking time until he can escape.

Here again, the cause for the problem is rooted in the early training period, yet the impact is delayed until the child meets up with the reality of school and has this mighty force to contend with and react against. The undisciplined child has generally had an inadequate experience of affection. At least in this one area of his personal needs, he has been neglected. No one has cared enough about him to help him

either to learn how or to want to conform to the society of his home and in turn with other social groups. His adjustment is to set himself aggressively out against others who might interfere with his independence. Being unprepared for a satisfactory kind of independence, he battles for what he believes will be personal satisfaction. Experience has probably taught him that what interference he has met was unreasonable, or imposed only because of his annoyance to others rather than because they cared about him.

In a permissive school environment, such a child can be expected to act out his aggression through direct attack on the personnel, on other children or against property. Within a strict environment, the aggression may be delayed for a long period of time out of fear of the consequence. If not delayed, it may well get expressed in secret and indirect ways.

Here again is a child who can make a pseudo-adjustment to school, during which time his hate for the school mounts to a boiling point. His real problem may go unrecognized until such time as his symptomatic behavior is out in the open. By then, his mind may be well set against school. His hostility has been stored up and there has been no displacement of his aggression in relation to the demands made upon him. Only the fear of consequence has caused him to wait his turn to retaliate. The little child, because of his size and limited experience, can sometimes wait endlessly before he expresses his true feelings. He does this even at the expense of having had to store his frustrations, all along the way. Only as he grows to feel more adequate physically and mentally will he feel strong enough within himself to act against restrictions.

Such aggressive youngsters need and often seek a restraining and limiting environment. They like the strict teacher and the school with set rules because these help them to feel safe from their own impulses. However, they need at the same time both warmth and understanding from those in authority. Restrictions only serve to further damage them if these are enforced by unloving people who cause the child to be humiliated and punished.

Ironically, the parents of acting out, aggressive children often want the school to take over the responsibility for discipline that they themselves have shirked or have been unable to take for reasons of their own. This desire serves to place the responsibility out of their hands and they become free of blame for any failure on the child's part. The youngster is then conflicted over the different expectations that his parents have for him at home and at school. He is caught in the inconsistancies of his two social groups.

Because negatively aggressive children create anxiety in other children by their misbehavior, they are often left out of the usual peer group relationships. Their being disliked and feared tends to goad them into further self-assertion. This sometimes gets directed into a kind of leadership by which they organize their own groups. These may be composed of other youngsters like themselves, but they also attract some of those children who are repressed. The overly aggressive child and the withdrawn ones can be brought together by their mutual loneliness. It is through such gang-type groups that some repressed children can get their only experience of aggression. This may never be overt on their part, but their identity with such a group can cause them mistakenly to feel that expressed aggression on the part of any other member is actually their own self-assertion. When the neurotic child does feel heroic enough to act out his aggressive impulses it is usually because he has been provoked into doing this by somebody else, or is able to do it because of the kind of support he gets from the fact that someone else "did it first", and he is caught in the chain reaction. Here again the child is acting as the authority dictates, not as himself. He is being loving and obedient to his peer authority. This expression of the collective anti-school set of mind is common to many classroom situations and evident on the school playgrounds. Here the groups are not formally organized, but do have the structure of pupil leaders and their followers acting and interacting as the antagonists. Individual attitudes and feelings against school become reinforced by such group association.

A child is motivated to think, feel, and act against school when some of his basic needs are not being adequately met or were not met at an appropriate period in his earlier development. Nature has its way of giving individuals later chances to resolve early emotional situations that have been damaging to them. This fact justifies our efforts to help human beings, at any stage in the life process. Children in school are especially available for help and we should regard it as their right to have the kind of opportunities that are necessary to offer this help. For those children whose personal inadequacies cause them to be unable to use such opportunities, we have the added responsibility for helping them to engage themselves in their use. This means the necessity for an individualized type of service.

The experience of school is essentially planned to meet the common needs of most children while they are away from home and in a situation of formal learning. Those who have experienced a continuum in their growth and development processes that has been orderly and goal

directed are usually well able to adapt themselves to school and use their capacities to proceed ahead toward maturation. Those children who have patterns of marked variability, the ones who are disorganized or poorly organized, will require individualized help in establishing for themselves a stable enough equilibrium to be able to make a favorable adaptation to school.

Children with anti-school patterns can feel doomed to an unsatisfactory living experience. Their being compelled to attend and expected to succeed in the face of keen competition and with the odds against them can be an overwhelming experience that must seem endless. Before achievement in learning can be attained, the child's sense of futility must be dissolved. The school itself must feel enough reliance in the human being to be willing to stand by the child, expecting little in academic performance or social adjustment, until such time as he is able to resolve his sense of futility.

We can well understand the general human patterns of behavior in children out of our own experience of having once been a child and from our experiences with children and about them. Those patterns of variability in individual children must be understood through a sequential observation of them, which enables us to diagnose their problems and thus anticipate and provide the kind of, and extent of guidance they will need in order to develop and use their capacities toward greater achievement.

MEMBERSHIP

Membership in a professional organization is a strengthening factor for the individual practicing within that profession. This is as true for the school social worker as it has long been for members of other professions. National Association of School Social Workers has members in 38 states and in Hawaii, Puerto Rico and India.

All members receive the National Association of School Social Workers Bulletin and other materials such as Newsletter, book lists, conference programs, notices, and other publicity. Membership is determined by the training and experience of the applicant.

Applications for membership and a statement of membership requirements may be obtained from the Membership Chairman, Mrs. Helen Roell, Indianapolis Public Schools, 150 N. Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Indiana.

* * * *

Copies of some issues of N. A. S. S. W. Bulletins from 1946 to the present are available at the National Office in limited quantities.

* * * *

Changes of address should reach the NATIONAL OFFICE as soon as possible.

* * * *

The Editorial Committee would like to publish material representative of practice throughout the country. Persons interested in having articles considered for publication are encouraged to submit them to the Editor of the *Bulletin.*

* * * *

The Bulletin is issued quarterly.

Single copies, 65 cents. Larger quantities at reduced rates.